

## **Responses to Comments in Letter 157 from Sara Shields-Priddy, Lynden Resident**

***Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.***

1. A detailed air quality impact analysis was prepared for this project that incorporated the best available data to evaluate impacts associated with the proposed project. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of air quality impacts in Canada. The air quality analysis was based on data from the Abbotsford monitoring station because it is the closest station to the proposed project site. The Chilliwack and Hope stations are approximately 20 miles and 50 miles east of Abbotsford, respectively. Following publication of the Draft EIS, air quality monitoring data from Chilliwack and Hope were evaluated and compared with the monitoring data from Abbotsford used in the air quality analyses. For the same time frames (1996 through 1999) and for the same constituents (NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and ozone), the existing air contaminant concentrations in Chilliwack and Hope were less than or equal to those reported in Abbotsford (Letter from David Weeks, Sumas Energy 2 – PSD Hearing Bench Request, October 16, 2000). Therefore, the data used in analyses were more representative of local conditions than would have been the data from either Chilliwack or Hope. In addition, since the ambient concentrations were higher at the Abbotsford station, the impact analyses were worst-case with respect to the incremental impact of the proposed project.
2. In response to public and agency comments on the Draft EIS, discussion of impacts in Canada has been added to several places in this Final EIS. EFSEC sent out general public information notices to state and local agencies as well as the general public on their mailing list (as outlined under WAC 197-11-150). Notices for the April 3 and 4, 2000 public comment meetings were published in:  
  
Bellingham Herald: March 23, 2000  
Lynden Tribune: March 29, 2000  
Abbotsford News: March 23, 2000  
  
In addition to the mailings, EFSEC posted the Draft EIS and extensions of the comment period on their Web site.
3. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of air quality standards and human health considerations. The primary air quality standards are established at conservative levels to protect health. Secondary standards set limits to protect public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings. Because the project complies with all primary standards related to the protection of human health, it is unlikely that the emissions would have an impact on forest lands.

4. The proposed facility would be subject to emission limits established by regulation and incorporated into the facility's operating permit. New regulatory requirements would be incorporated into operating permit renewals.
5. The 115 kV power lines that run through Whatcom County are no longer part of the project. Only the 230 kV line to Canada is included in the project. Please see General Response B for discussion of impacts of the 230 kV line in Abbotsford.